



## Comparative study of urinary tract infection in patients with or without diabetes: A prospective study from central India

Dr. Aarti Akhand<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Debasis Biswas<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Mahendra Tilkar<sup>3\*</sup>, Dr. Mayank Tenguriya<sup>4</sup>, Dr. Yogesh Tilkar<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty Medical Microbiology, Linience Biotech Lab, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup> Professor & Head Department of Microbiology, AIIMS, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor Medicine, AIIMS, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>4</sup> Director Linience Biotech Lab, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>5</sup> Associate Professor, Index Medical College, Madhya Pradesh, India

### Abstract

**Background:** Urinary tract infections (UTIs) are common in both diabetic and non-diabetic patients. Antimicrobials susceptibility for microorganisms causing UTI varies from place to place and time to time, hence it is important to screen the trends and susceptibility pattern of predominant organisms against antimicrobials.

**Aims and Objectives:** To determine the spectrum of uropathogens and antibiotic sensitivity pattern in patients with and without diabetes (DM) in patients with clinically suspected UTI.

**Material and Methods:** Two hundred patients with UTI were studied with clinically diagnosed UTI, attending both outpatients and inpatients of AIIMS Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh from February 2016 to December 2017. Two groups were formed as Group A (n=100; patients with DM) and Group B (n=100; patients without DM). All samples and isolates were investigated by standard laboratory procedures.

**Results:** A total of 32.5% samples showed significant growth. No significant difference among culture positivity rate was noted between Group A and Group B (36.4% Vs 25.6%). *Escherichia coli* were the most frequent organism (65.6% in Group A and 67.8% in Group B). Gentamycin and nitrofurantoin were highly sensitive to *E. coli* isolated in diabetic patients among the tested antimicrobials followed by cotrimoxazole, norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin. Least sensitivity rate was observed with ampicillin and cephalexin. However, no difference was noted on the sensitivity pattern of the antimicrobials among *E. coli* isolated between group A and Group B.

**Conclusion:** High proportion of gram negative bacilli with predominant uropathogen being *E. coli* was noted. Irrespective of the status of diabetes, *Staphylococcus* spp and *Pseudomonas* spp were not isolated from UTI patients in our study. The isolation of organisms and their resistance pattern was almost similar between diabetic and non-diabetic patients.

**Keywords:** antibiotic susceptibility test, diabetes mellitus, urinary tract infection

### Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a group of metabolic diseases characterized by hyperglycemia resulting from defects in insulin secretion, insulin action or both. It has been estimated that 347 million people worldwide have diabetes [1, 2].

The chronic hyperglycemia is linked with long term damage, dysfunction, and failure of various organs especially the eyes, genitourinary system, nerves, heart, and blood vessels which can termed as micro and macrovascular complications [3]. Over time, patients with diabetes may develop cystopathy, nephropathy, and renal papillary necrosis, complications that predispose them to urinary tract infections (UTIs) [3]. UTI which is defined as the presence and active multiplication of microorganisms within the urinary tract is one of the commonest bacterial infections seeking treatment in clinical practice [4].

Susceptibility increases with the longer duration and great severity of diabetes. The high urine glucose content and defective host immune factors predispose to infection. Hyperglycemia causes neutrophil dysfunction by increasing

intracellular calcium levels and interfering with actin and, thus, diapedesis and phagocytosis [4].

Evidences suggest that the incidence of UTI in diabetes patients is four times higher comparing to non-diabetes patients [5]. It has been reported elsewhere that the occurrence of UTI in diabetic patients is more in people with low socioeconomic status and the resistant pattern of antibiotic agents against organisms isolated in diabetic patients were different to the non-diabetic patients [6].

Microorganisms causing UTI vary in their susceptibility to antimicrobials from place to place and time to time. Resistant to newer and more potent antimicrobials are making the therapeutic options very limited in case of UTI. In Bhopal Madhya Pradesh, there have been several studies focusing on antibiotic susceptibility patterns of uropathogens [7, 8]. But the studies on spectrum of uropathogens and the profile of antibiotic resistance in UTI patients with and without diabetes are limited, at least as scientific publications. Thus the screening of UTI in diabetic patients is essential and has no alternative so far.

Hence, present study was performed to understand the incidence of spectrum of uropathogens and antibiotic sensitivity pattern in both diabetic and non diabetic patients with clinically suspected UTI.

**Materials and Methods**

Present prospective cross sectional study was done on 200 patients (100 with DM and 100 without DM) with clinically diagnosed UTI, attending both outpatients and inpatients of AIIMS Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh. Two groups were formed as Group A (n=100; patients with DM) and Group B(n=100; patients without DM).

Study was approved by Institutional Ethics Committee approval was obtained before starting the study. Study was conducted during period of February 2016 to December 2017 in the Department of Microbiology and Department of Clinical Biochemsitry, AIMMS Bhopal. The diagnosis of diabetes was based on WHO-2003 glucose based criteria [9]. Clean voided midstream urine samples were collected in sterile containers after giving proper instructions and samples were processed in the laboratory within 2 hours of collection. Urine cultures were done by inoculating urine samples on Blood agar and MacConkey agar plates using a calibrated loop (0.001ml) and incubated at 37oC for 18-24 hours. Those culture reports were considered

Positive who had colony forming units more than 105/mL of voided urine. The presence of yeast in any number was considered to be significant. The pathogens were isolated and specific biochemical tests were done for identifying the species of the pathogens. Antimicrzobial sensitivity was done by Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method according to CLSI guidelines [10].

All the data was analyzed using IBM SPSS Ver. 20 software. Frequency distribution and cross tabulation was used to prepare table. Data is expressed as percentage. P value of <0.05 is considered as significant.

**Results**


Out of 200 urine samples, 100 patients (70 females and 30 males) were diabetic and 100 (72 females and 28 males) were non diabetic patients.

The mean ages of patients in Group A and Group B was 57.23±1.42 years and 53.45±1.42 years respectively. Overall 36.4% patients in Group A were culture positive whereas In Group B there was 25.6% patients who were culture positive. A total of 32.5%) samples showed significant growth. The study showed that UTI is more common in females than in males. Rate of culture positivity in different category of population is given in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Rate of culture positive UTI in different category of population

Category of patients		Group A		Total	Group B		Total
		Male	Female		Male	Female	
Culture Status	Positive	11 (36.67)	23 (32.85)	34 (34)	8 (26.7)	19 (26.6)	27 (27)
	Negative	19 (63.33)	47 (67.14)	66 (66)	20 (73.4)	53 (73.4)	73 (73)
Total No. of suspected UTI		30(100)	70 (100)	100 (100)	28 (100)	72(100)	100 (100)

Escherichia coli was the most frequent organism isolated in UTI patients accounting 65.6% in Group A and 67.8% Group B patients followed by Klebsiella sps accounting 23.6% in Group A and 13.6% in Group B patients.



**Fig 1:** Isolation rate of uropathogens isolated in patients between groups

Gentamycin and nitrofurantoin were found to be highly sensitive to E. coli isolated in diabetic patients among the tested antimicrobials followed by cotrimoxazole, norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin. Least sensitivity rate was observed with ampicillin and cephalixin. However, we found no difference on the sensitivity pattern of the antimicrobials among E. coli isolated between Group A and group B. No associations of the antibiotic sensitivity pattern were shown among other microorganisms because of the low isolation rate.

**Discussion**

In present study we have tried to determine whether there are differences in the microbiological patterns of UTI and in the antibiotic sensitivity patterns of the pathogens concerned with diabetic and non-diabetic patients. The overall prevalence of UTI in diabetic and non-diabetic patients was 34% and 27% respectively. The bacteria causing UTI in diabetic patients are the same as in non-diabetic patients and the predominant of pathogens isolated in present study were gram negative enteric organisms that commonly cause UTI. Regarding the antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of the uropathogens, we observed that the isolated gram negative enteric organisms were sensitive at similar rates in both diabetic and non-diabetic patients.

The age and the gender were almost comparable in both the groups. It is stated that UTI is predominantly a disease of the female due to a short urethra and proximity to the anal opening. The majority of the study all over the world has concluded female predominance to UTI over male [11, 12]. Our finding of female predominance is not in accordance with the results from a study [13], where male were more infected than female among diabetic patients. Evidence from various epidemiological studies showed that UTI is more common in female with diabetes than in non-diabetes female as a consequence of debilitated immune system [14]. However our

study did not revealed the differences among diabetic and non-diabetic female patients. This differences might have been attributed to factors such as geographical variations, ethnicity of study participants and variation in the screening tests used <sup>[15, 16]</sup>.

The overall culture positivity rate in our study among diabetic patients was found to be 34.5% and among non-diabetic patients was 26.7%. This is in accordance with the study done in a hospital in Bangladesh where the sample population was almost similar to our study <sup>[17]</sup>. The diabetic patients are more prone to infectious diseases. A similar study <sup>[18]</sup> reported 20 % UTI in diabetic patients in their study. However, a study on a large series of diabetic and non-diabetic patients from a hospital in Italy, the culture positivity rate was 15% and 14% in diabetic and non-diabetic population respectively. <sup>11</sup> This could be due to the differences in the sample size in these different studies.

UTIs are caused by variety of microorganisms, including both gram positive and gram negative ones. The etiology of UTI has been regarded as well-established and reasonably consistent. The predominant numbers of pathogens isolated in our study were gram negative bacilli rather than gram positive pathogens. The rate of *E. coli* isolation we found in both diabetic and non-diabetic patients are almost similar, which predominant organism is constituted 65% and 67% among diabetic and non-diabetic patients respectively. This is similar with the data obtained by various studies indicated that gram negative bacteria mostly *E. coli* and *Klebsiella* are the predominant pathogen isolated in patients with UTI irrespective of risk factors associated with it <sup>[18, 19]</sup>. this was followed by *Klebsiella* sps and *Enterococcus* sps. In another study from Nepal, it was found that *E. coli* was most commonly grown organism (68.7%) followed by *Enterococcus* sps (13.92%) <sup>[8]</sup>. A study from India has revealed *Staphylococcus* sps as the second predominant isolates which is absolutely absent in our findings <sup>[13]</sup>. There was no difference between the rate of isolation of organisms in diabetic and non-diabetic patients in our study which is in accordance with the study done in Bangladesh <sup>[20]</sup>. It is noted that in a clinical setting different from ours, urinary isolates of symptomatic post menopausal women did not show a significant difference in the bacterial species when compared to the matched group of women without diabetes mellitus <sup>[21]</sup>.

Regarding the antimicrobial resistant profile of the uropathogens, in our study, 65% of the isolates were *E. coli* among gram negative pathogens, and were sensitive at similar rates to all the antibiotics used in this study in both diabetic and non-diabetic patients. The low rate of *E. coli* sensitivity to ampicillin and cephalexin we found in our study precludes, at least in our area, the choice of these or similar drugs in the empirical initial treatment of patients with UTI. The significant differences between diabetic and non-diabetic patients to the sensitivity to gentamycin, ciprofloxacin and nitrofurantoin were noted in a study from Bangladesh.

Moreover this difference in sensitivity pattern of isolates could be attributed to time difference between the two studies or environment factors such as practices of self-medications, the drug abuse and indiscriminate misuse of antibiotics among the general population which has favored the emergence of resistance strains.

The limitations of our study were, first information regarding type and duration of diabetes was lacking and second was we could not elaborate the correlation of all the uropathogens among various age groups, regions and socioeconomic status due to low sample size and isolation rate.

### Conclusion

We found high proportion of gram negative bacilli with predominant uropathogen being *E. coli* in both diabetic and non-diabetic patients. The sensitivity of uropathogens to the antibiotics was similar in study participants. Both diabetic and non-diabetic patients are at high risk of development of UTIs, so laboratories should encourage accurate bacteriological record keeping of urinary isolates. Therefore, continued surveillance of sensitivity rates among uropathogens is needed to ensure appropriate recommendations for the treatment of these infections.

### References

1. Danaei G, Finucane MM, Lu Y, Singh GM, Cowan MJ, Paciorek CJ *et al*. National, regional, and global trends in fasting plasma glucose and diabetes prevalence since 1980: systematic analysis of health examination surveys and epidemiological studies with 370 country-years and 2.7 million participants. *Lancet*. 2011; 378(9785):31-40.
2. World Health Organisation (WHO). South Eastern Asia Region: Nepal statistics summary (2002-present). Updated cited Available from: 2011-2013. [http://www.who.int/nmh/countries/npl\\_en.pdf](http://www.who.int/nmh/countries/npl_en.pdf)
3. Wild S, Roglic G, Green A, Sicree R, King H. Global prevalence of diabetes: Estimates for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. *Diabetes care*, 2004; 27:1047-53.
4. Banerjee S. The study of urinary tract infections and antibiogram of uropathogens in and around Ahmadnagar, Maharashtra. *Int J Infect Dis*, 2011; 9(1).
5. Saleem M, Daniel B. Prevalence of urinary tract infection among patients with diabetes in Bangalore City. *Int. J. Emerg. Sci*. 2011; 1(2):133-42.
6. Adeyeba OA, Adesiji YO, Omosigho PO. Bacterial urinary tract infections in patients with diabetes mellitus. *Int J Trop Med*, 2007; 2:89-92.
7. Jha BK, Singh YI, Khanal LK, Sanjan RK. Prevalence of asymptomatic bacteriuria among elderly diabetic patients residing in Chitwan. *Kathmandu Univ Med J*. 2009; 7(2):157-61.
8. Acharya A, Gautam R, Subedee L. Uropathogens and their antimicrobial susceptibility pattern in Bharatpur, Nepal. *Nepal Med Col J*. 2011; 13(1):30-33.
9. World Health Organization: Definition, Diagnosis and Classification of diabetes mellitus and its complications; Part 1: Diagnosis and Classification of diabetes mellitus, Geneva. Department of non-communicable Disease Surveillance. WHO, 2003.
10. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing: Twenty-first Informational Supplement M100-S21. CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA, 2012.
11. Boladio M, Costarelli S, Morelli G, Tartaglia T. The influence of diabetes mellitus on the spectrum of uropathogens and the antimicrobial resistance in elderly

- adult patients with urinary tract infection. *BMC Inf Dis.* 2006; 6:54.
12. Jha N, Bapat SK. A study of sensitivity and resistance of pathogenic micro-organisms causing UTI in Kathmandu Valley. *Kathmandu Univ Med J.* 2005; 3(2):123-9.
  13. Sibi G, Aheibam PD, Fouzia K, Patil, BR. Prevalence, microbiologic profile of urinary tract infection and its treatment with trimethoprim in diabetes patients. *Res. J. Microbiol.* 2011, 1-8.
  14. Patterson JE, Andriole VT. Bacterial urinary tract infections in diabetics. *Infect Dis Clin North Am.* 1997; 11(3):735-50.
  15. Longdoh NA, Assob JCN, Nsagha SD, Nde PF, Kamga HLF, Nkume AF *et al.* Uropathogens from diabetic patients with asymptomatic bacteriuria and urinary tract infections. *The West London Medical Jokurnal.* 2013; 5(1):7-14.
  16. Hansen DS, Gottschau A, Kolmos HJ. Epidemiology of *Klebsiella* bacteraemia: a case control study using *E. coli* bacteraemia as Control. *J Hosp Infect*, 1998; 38:119-32.
  17. Geerling SE, Stolk RP, Camps MJL, Netten PM, Hoekstra JBL, Bouteer KP *et al.* Asymptomatic bacteriuria may be considered a complication in women with diabetes. *Diabetes care*, 2000; 23(6):744-49.
  18. Bashir MF, Qazi JI, Ahmed N, Riaz S. Diversity of urinary tract pathogens and drug resistant isolates of *Escherichia coli* in different age and gender groups of Pakistanis. *Trop J pharm Res*, 2008; 7:1025-31.
  19. Mohammadi M, Ghasemi E, Mokhayer H, Pournia Y, Borou H. Antimicrobial resistance pattern of *E. coli* detected from hospitalized urine culture samples. *Asian J Biol Sci*, 2010; 3:195-201.
  20. Saber MH, Barai L, Haq JA, Jilani MSA, Begum J. The pattern of organism causing urinary tract infection in diabetic and non-diabetic patients in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh J Med Microbiol*, 2010; 4:6-8.
  21. Boyoko EJ, Fihn SD, Scholes D, Chen CL, Normand EH, Yarbrow P. Diabetes and risk of acute urinary tract infection among post-menopausal women. *Diabetes care.* 2002; 25(10):1778-83.